

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 1-9, 11-19 and 21-29 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Kawai, et al. reference. With respect to applicants' claims, as amended, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended to better define the applicants' invention. More particularly, each of these claims has now been amended to recite that a second camera index on a map is indicative of a state of a current tilting direction of a camera in relation to a camera index by changing the second camera index up and down along a vertical direction of a screen without depending on a state of a current panning direction of the camera. Such construction is not taught or suggested by the cited Kawai, et al. reference.

The Examiner has argued with respect to the Kawai, et al. reference as follows:

"Kawai further depicts in Figures 14, 13a, 13b and discusses on Column 12, Lines 35-44 a second camera index on the map (155) to display a second camera index indicative of the current state of tilting direction. Kawai, et al. depicts in Figure 14 that the orientation of the camera depends on the current condition of the pan direction. The Camera (42-6) is clearly not oriented in a way as to make the direction line (155) move in the horizontal direction during a tilt operation. It is clear that if the camera (42-6) was oriented in a pan direction so that the line (154) was vertical, the direction that the tilt line (155) would move to change the tilt angle would be in a vertical direction moving up and down relative to the screen. Furthermore, the direction of camera (42-6) shown in Figure 14 requires that the direction of the tilt line be moved in both a horizontal and vertical direction since its angled direction contains both a horizontal and vertical component."

It is evident from the Examiner's above argument that, in the Kawai, et al. reference, the movement up and down in the vertical direction of the tilt line 155 is dependent on the pan

direction of the camera. The reference thus fails to teach or suggest a construction in which such movement be without depending on the state of the current pan direction of the camera.


Applicants amended claims 1, 11 and 21, and their respective dependent claims, all of which recite a "second camera index on the map, indicative of a state of a current tilting direction of the camera in relation to the camera index by changing said second camera index up and down along a vertical direction of a screen without depending on a state of a current panning direction of the camera", thus patentably distinguish over the Kawai, et al. reference.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: July 31, 2003

ROBIN, BLECKER & DALEY
330 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 682-9640

Respectfully submitted,


John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,369
An Attorney of Record